

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~1st October, 1959.COCOM Document No. 3688BCOORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSION

4248988

ONA FRENCH PROPOSAL TO EXPORT MATERIAL FOR HERTZIAN LINKS TO POLAND24th September, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents 3369, 3404, 3406, 3427, 3634, 3659, 3660, 3671.

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the French Delegate whether ^{he} had anything to add to the statements made both by himself and by other Delegates during the exchange of views to which this proposal had already given rise.
2. The FRENCH Delegate stated that he had nothing to add for the time being. He considered that his Delegation had amply demonstrated that the equipment concerned was television equipment. The French Delegation remained convinced that the Committee should be able to approve this export under the special policy adopted for Poland. They now awaited the replies of the other Member Governments.
3. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate stated that his authorities had made a careful study of the technical aspects of this case and had concluded that the equipment was covered by Item 1520. Given the strategic value of the material and the size of the order, they considered that neither the ad hoc nor the special Polish procedure was applicable to this request. If it were approved it would have the effect of completely frustrating the embargo on this type of equipment and would lead to difficulties in Member Countries where similar orders had been refused. For these reasons the United Kingdom authorities could not give their approval to the French request. They felt that the best procedure would be to submit a redefinition proposal for the relevant part of the item in question.
4. The FRENCH Delegate stated that he did not have at hand a collection of all the Polish cases, but he did not see why the special procedure extended to that country could not apply to the request submitted by his Government. The Delegate pointed out to his United Kingdom colleague that a transaction involving only 130 million francs was not enormous. The Delegate stressed once more that when the definition of Item 1520 was under review the Consultative Group had declined to limit the exclusion to local systems or to withhold the benefit from multiple networks.
5. The BELGIAN Delegate, like his United Kingdom and United States colleagues, considered that the strategic risks involved in this export outweighed the considerations governing the special policy adopted for Poland. He stated that his Government, before deciding upon a final position, wished to hear the technical arguments of other Delegations.
6. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that after a fresh study of the German request his authorities still found no reason for its approval. They did not feel that the special Polish procedure provided the necessary justification. They believed that the equipment was destined for use in the strategic defence communications system of the Bloc. Even if the equipment permitted only

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3688B

one-way communication it would also serve the needs of a strategic communications system since it could, for example, transmit early warning information, serve as a radar relay or be used to collect weather intelligence in one direction and later serve to transmit completed weather maps in the opposite direction. It could also be used for high volume teletype transmission in one direction at a time. It would, moreover, be possible to convert the material to permit simultaneous two-way transmission either by regrouping various units or by adding additional intermediate repeaters. In any event, the United States authorities felt that Item 1520 covered equipment for both one-way and two-way transmission. Finally, they considered that there was a serious shortage of such strategic telecommunications equipment within the Soviet Bloc, and the Free World should not assist the Bloc in remedying this shortage.

7. The NETHERLANDS Delegate said that his authorities were of the opinion that the equipment concerned was definitely of strategic value and was caught by Item 1520. They were willing to raise no objection to this export, however, if the majority of the Committee considered that it was justified under the provisions of the special Polish procedure.

8. The ITALIAN Delegate stated that his authorities had studied the French request with the greatest care. They noted with satisfaction that the French Delegation had submitted this matter to the Committee as an exception case, and not in the form of a statement of intent to export to Poland equipment which was beyond doubt embargoed. The Delegate regretted that for the time being he had no final instructions, as the matter was still being studied by the Italian experts and as the Italian authorities wished to learn the outcome of the present discussion before deciding upon their final position.

9. The CANADIAN Delegate informed the Committee that he would be able to give the final views of his authorities within one week. Their preliminary reaction was not favourable, however, since they felt that the material was definitely caught by Item 1520.

10. The JAPANESE Delegate stated that his authorities had studied the French request very carefully. They had reached the conclusion that the equipment concerned was covered by Item 1520 but they had not yet come to a decision regarding the exception request proper.

11. The DANISH Delegate said that his authorities were open-minded on this question.

12. The FRENCH Delegate wished to answer his United Kingdom colleague's objections of principle and the more technical objections of the United States Delegate. He stated that obviously, by means of costly adaptations, there was always a possibility of converting to strategic ends material which was not strategic in itself. In the case of the French material, the contemplated link was essentially a unilateral television link which could not possibly be used for the transmission of a large number of telephone channels. The French equipment consisted only of a single rectangular wave guide and no branch filter. The fact that there were no branch filters - these were very expensive and it was unlikely that the Poles manufactured them - prevented use of the rectangular guide simultaneously for sending and receiving. The United States experts had stated that the material in question could easily be folded. The Delegate pointed out in this connection that the French material only included cabinets regulated on two frequencies, whereas in a Hertzian link of great capacity the material used was regulated on 12 frequencies. The Delegate stressed moreover that the installation was to be carried out by the exporter himself. No system of station telecommand or telesurveillance would be supplied. As was well known, however, such a system was indispensable to the use of this material for strategic ends. Finally, the constructor would retain control of the special valves and spare parts. As these were of a highly complex type, there seemed no question of the Poles being able to reproduce them.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

COCOM Document No. 3688B

For all these reasons, the French Delegation could give the Committee the assurance that the material involved would in fact be used to set up a commercial television system to operate between Lodz on the one hand and Warsaw, Poznan and Kattowitz on the other. It would be impossible to use it for strategic ends without the direct intervention of the constructor. If changes allowing a utilisation other than strictly commercial television were to be undertaken, this would only be done with the Committee's full agreement.

13. The GERMAN Delegate said that he fully agreed with the information which had been given by his French colleague on the technical aspects of the case. He would now deal with the general arguments that had been raised. He first of all wished to thank the majority of Delegations who, although they know there was some opposition to this request, had nevertheless been willing to wait until the present discussion had taken place before giving their final views. Addressing himself next to the two Delegations who had raised firm objections, he asked the following three questions:

- (a) Did they doubt that these Hertzian links were required for television since it was known that the Poles were intending to expand their television network ?
- (b) Given that this equipment was used for television, was television itself of strategic importance ? He did not think that this was so, since television apparatus was not on the embargo list.
- (c) It had been said that the special Polish procedure did not apply in this case. What was the objection to the use of the Polish procedure ? It had been claimed that the material could be transformed into radar equipment or used in an early warning system. If the Poles had the technical knowledge or the production capacity to effect the transformation, the embargo would have no meaning. The equipment could not be used for radar purposes because this would involve the transformation of radar photographs into television pictures. It had also been said that the size of the request was too large and that delivery of so much equipment would frustrate the embargo. The Delegate could not concur with this statement since only a relatively small shipment was involved, being the minimum quantity necessary for the stated end-use.

14. The FRENCH Delegate thanked his German colleague for the statement he had just made, which corresponded entirely to the French Delegation's views.

15. The UNITED STATES Delegate replied to the questions put by his German colleague. With regard to the end-use, his authorities were convinced that this equipment could and would be used as part of the strategic defence system of the Bloc. As for the strategic value, his authorities considered that this was undoubted and that was why this equipment was under embargo. The fact that additional material would be required to give the present equipment a more strategic character was no reason for permitting its export in the first place. It had been argued that the equipment would be supplied by the Soviet Bloc if it were not obtained from the West, but there was still known to be a very serious deficiency in this field within the Bloc. The manufacturer's own engineers might well install the equipment but who could guarantee how long their future connection with it would last ? Finally, with regard to the special Polish procedure, there was no objection to submitting the proposal under this procedure; it was simply that in the eyes of the United States authorities this was not a case that justified the more lenient treatment provided for by the special Polish exceptions procedure. The provision of this equipment was not reasonable or necessary to the Polish civilian economy. They considered that it would materially assist the strategic defence effort of the Soviet Bloc as a whole.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 4 -

COCOM Document No. 3688B

16. The GERMAN Delegate said that he would rephrase his questions because there seemed to have been some misunderstanding. It was a fact that the Poles were about to expand their television network. Was this fact contested? Secondly, in what way was television strategic? This was the very same material which could be freely exported if it were to provide a link between a camera and the studio; it was simply to be used between two transmitters. Thirdly, did not the Polish procedure take into account the civil end-use? Television was surely first and foremost a cultural medium. The equipment concerned was used in the West only for television purposes.
17. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate reiterated that the material could still be used for some purpose other than television. The strategic risks involved outweighed the advantages which might be afforded to Poland.
18. The UNITED STATES Delegate commented that there was hardly any item on the embargo list which could not be used innocuously. Some television equipment was not covered but other types were of great strategic importance, regardless of the possibility of non-strategic use also. In the view of the United States authorities, this particular equipment could be used as part of a strategic communications system even though it could also be used harmlessly.
19. The FRENCH Delegate noted that it was very difficult, at the present stage of the discussion, to reach common ground. The German and French Delegations relied on precise facts which could be verified, whereas the United Kingdom and United States Delegations based their arguments on hypotheses. The Delegate enquired on what basis these Delegations stated that the French material would serve strategic ends. Did they consider television to be strategic? In that case, how did they explain the fact that transmitters enabling radar pictures to be sent over greater distances than the material now being studied were not under embargo? The Delegate asked these Delegations to consider afresh the facts just submitted by the German and French Delegations, and he expressed the hope that they would then find it possible to adopt a different attitude.
20. The CHAIRMAN concluded by expressing the hope that the pertinent arguments just put forward on both sides would allow Delegations who had not yet taken up a position to make known their authorities' final decision in the near future.
21. The COMMITTEE agreed to hear the further views of Governments on October 8th.

CONFIDENTIAL